

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-17, 19-36 and 38-52 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1 and 18 have been amended to more clearly point out Applicants' invention. No new matter has been added to the application.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the claim by the current amendment. The attached page is captioned **"Version with markings to show changes made."**

### **35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) Rejection of Claims 1-14, 18-33, 36 and 38-52**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-14, 18-33, 36 and 38-52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,946,386 (Rogers) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,276,731 (Arbel). The Examiner correctly notes that Rogers does not teach or disclose call forwarding profiles created in an IP network. The Examiner contends that Arbel teaches creating a call forwarding profile. The Examiner argues that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to allow subscribers to create call forwarding profiles in an IP network. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The present invention is directed to a method for providing call forwarding in an IP telephone network. A second telephone is used to dial a unique identifier for a first telephone to make a call. The call is sent to a call management device located in the IP telephone network. The call management device sends call destination information to customer premises equipment responsible for the first telephone. The customer premises equipment checks stored call forwarding profiles in the customer premises equipment to determine whether there is an active call forwarding profile for the first telephone. The call management device extends the call via the customer premises equipment to the first telephone if an active call forwarding profile is not found. The customer premises equipment sends call forwarding information for the first telephone to the call management device if there is an active call forwarding profile for the first telephone. The call management device receives the call forwarding information and routes the call to at least a third telephone based on the call forwarding information.

Rogers discloses a call management system for management of calls by system users at their workstations. The call management system is located on the customer premises between the PBX and the network central office. As stated in Applicants' response filed on October 31, 2002, the Examiner clarified to Applicants' representative that the central office disclosed in Rogers corresponds to the network device (now amended to recite "call management" device in claims 1 and 19) of the present invention and the call management computer 101 of Rogers corresponds to the customer premise equipment of the present invention.

Rogers discloses a call management computer 101 that affects a call transfer by establishing a call connection to a telephone. In establishing that call connection, the call

management computer 101 does not send call forwarding information to the network device (i.e., central office 103), but rather performs the call connection function itself.

Independent claims 1, 19, 38 and 52 of the present invention recite that call forwarding information obtained from the customer premise equipment is conveyed to the in-network call management device which is responsible for routing the call. In other words, in the present invention, the in-network call management device (i.e., the central office in Rogers) performs the call routing function and not the customer premise equipment (i.e., the call management computer in Rogers) as is the case in Rogers.

Arbel, like Rogers discloses a premise-based solution for providing call handling. While Arbel does contemplate the ability to provide call forwarding, that capability is handled by the customer premise equipment (IVDT of Arbel) and not by the network (i.e., call management device) as recited in independent claims 1, 19, 38 and 52 of the present invention. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Rogers nor Arbel, whether taken alone or in combination, teach or disclose Applicants invention as claimed in independent claims 1, 19, 38 and 52. More specifically, the combination of Rogers and Arbel fails to teach or disclose obtaining call forwarding information from the customer premise equipment and conveying the call forwarding information to the in-network call management device which then is responsible for routing the call in accordance with the call forwarding information. Claims 2-14, 20-33, 36 and 39-51, which depend from independent claims 1, 19 and 38, respectively, are also not taught or disclosed by the combination of Rogers and Arbel. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-14, 18-33, 36 and 38-52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

### **35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) Rejection of Claims 15, 16, 34 and 35**

The Examiner has rejected claims 15, 16, 34 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,946,386 (Rogers) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,276,731 (Arbel) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,987,508 (Agraharam). The Examiner correctly notes that neither Rogers nor Arbel teach or disclose that the unique identifier is a telephone number or an IP address. The Examiner contends that Agraharam teaches a telephone number associated with an alias email address. The Examiner argues that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to connect the use between a telephone number and email address. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 15, 16, 34 and 35 are dependent upon independent claims 1 and 19 respectively. As stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Rogers nor Arbel, whether taken alone or in combination teach or disclose Applicants' invention as claims in independent claims 1 and 19. Neither reference teaches or discloses obtaining call forwarding information from the customer premise equipment and conveying the call forwarding information to the in-network call management device which then is responsible for routing the call in accordance with the call

forwarding information. Applicants submit that Agraharam, whether taken alone or in combination with Rogers and Arbel, does not teach these limitations. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the combinations of references do not render Applicants' invention obvious. Claims 15, 16 34 and 35 being dependent upon independent claims 1 and 19 are also not taught or disclosed by these references. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 15, 16 34 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance and reconsideration is requested. If the Examiner believes that any issues remain unresolved, a telephone call to the undersigned would be welcome.

Respectfully,  
Fen-Chung Kung et al.

By Michele L. Conover  
Michele L. Conover  
Senior Attorney  
Reg. No. 34962  
908-532-1879

AT&T Corp.

Date: 4/24/03

**Version with Markings to Show Changes Made**

**In the Claims:**

Amend claim 1.

1. (Twice Amended) A method for providing call forwarding in an IP telephone network, comprising the steps of:

dialing a unique identifier for a first telephone from a second telephone to make a call;

routing the call to a [network] call management device located in the IP telephone network;

said [network] call management device sending call destination information to a customer premises equipment responsible for said first telephone;

the customer premises equipment checking stored call forwarding profiles in the customer premises equipment to determine whether there is an active call forwarding profile for said first telephone, and;

said [network] call management device extending said call via said customer premises equipment to said first telephone if an active call forwarding profile is not found;

said customer premises equipment sending call forwarding information of said profile for said first telephone, which information includes conditions for call forwarding, to said [network] call management device, if there is an active call forwarding profile for said first telephone; and

said [network] call management device receiving said call forwarding information and routing the call to at least a third telephone based on the call forwarding information.

Cancel claim 18.

Amend claim 19.

19. (Twice Amended) An IP telephone system for providing call forwarding, comprising: a plurality of telephones, each telephone having a unique identifier;

a [network] call management device located in an IP network for routing telephone calls between the plurality of telephones;

customer premises devices serving at least one telephone, wherein the customer premises device has memory means for storing call forwarding profiles, means for determining if the call forwarding profile is active when a call is received at the customer premise device for the telephone and means for sending said active call forwarding profile to said [network] call management device;

wherein the call is routed by the [network] call management device to a telephone based on the call forwarding information contained in said active call forwarding profile.

Cancel claim 37.